UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,097	08/14/2008	Thomas Schuster	P/746-10 V1408	4051
	7590 02/25/201 FABER GERB & SOF	EXAMINER		
	OF THE AMERICAS	BROWE, DAVID		
NEW YORK, N	N 1 100308403		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/25/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/599,097	SCHUSTER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
DAVID M. BROWE	1617		

	DAVID W. BROWE	1017	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 February 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS.	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the company to the company to the comp	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS	ithin the time period set forth in 37	OFN 41.37(a).	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red		ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non Co	maliant Amandment (DTOL 224)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		impliant Amendment (100-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.		I be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Carlos A. Azpuru/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1617	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants arguments have been fully considered but are not found persuasive. Applicants assert that the Muller-Rees reference is lacking "any teaching...that irradiation of titanium dioxide containing effect pigments induces a breakdown of organic substances-such as UV absorbers"; and that the Schmid reference is "completely silent with respect to a UV protective cosmetic preparation...wherein the pigments are coated with silicon dioxide to isolate the titanium dioxide from its environment". The Examiner, however, would like to point out that the combination of the Muller-Rees and Schmid references teaches each and every structural limitation claimed by the Applicants, and, as the Schmid reference provides, the motivation to combine is that coating the titanium dioxide with the layer of silicon dioxide would protect the titanium dioxide from its environment when placed in a composition containing water (i.e. such as a lotion). Applicants functional claim language does not distinguish their structural limitations from the prior art, and one of ordinary skill in the art would be just as motivated to employ the silicon dioxide coating to protect the underlying titanium dioxide from its aqueous environment as one would be to protect the environment from the effects of irradiated titanium dioxide. Therefore, the Examiner maintains the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 1-12 as being unpatentable over Muller-Rees et al. (US Patent No. 5,851,277), in view of Schmid et al. (US Patent No. 6,533,857), for reasons of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID M. BROWE whose telephone number is 571-270-1320. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30AM-5PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fereydoun Sajjadi can be reached on 571-272-3311. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000..

DMB